

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

CALVIN LAVELLE TRAHAN

§
§
§
§
§

NO. 1:05-CR-24

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION FOR WARRANT
FOR OFFENDER UNDER SUPERVISION**

Pending is a “Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision” filed June 16, 2015, alleging that the Defendant, Calvin Lavelle Trahan, violated his conditions of supervised release. This matter is referred to the undersigned United States magistrate judge for review, hearing, and submission of a report with recommended findings of fact and conclusions of law. See United States v. Rodriguez, 23 F.3d 919, 920 n.1 (5th Cir. 1994); see also 18 U.S.C. § 3401(I) (2000); Local Rules for the Assignment of Duties to United States Magistrate Judges.

I. The Original Conviction and Sentence

Trahan was sentenced on January 20, 2006, before The Honorable David R. Herndon of the Southern District of Illinois after pleading guilty to the offense of Possession with Intent to Distribute Cocaine, a Class B felony. This offense carried a statutory maximum imprisonment term of 30 years. The guideline imprisonment range, based on a total offense level of 27 and a criminal history category of IV, was 120 to 125 months. Trahan was subsequently sentenced to 120 months of imprisonment (this term consists of a term of 120 months to be served concurrently with 05-30029-02), followed by an 5 year term of supervised release (said terms to run concurrently with the term of supervision on case number 05-30029-02).

II. The Period of Supervision

On January 14, 2013, Trahan completed his period of imprisonment and began service of the supervision term. On September 18, 2013, jurisdiction was transferred to the Eastern District of Texas.

III. The Petition

United States Probation filed the Petition for Warrant for Offender Under Supervision raising one allegation. The petition alleges that Trahan violated mandatory condition that he not commit another federal, state, or local crime. This allegation stems from Trahan's fraud conviction on May 13, 2015, in which he was sentenced to seven (7) years' imprisonment in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

IV. Proceedings

On May 24, 2016, the undersigned convened a hearing pursuant to Rule 32.1 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to hear evidence and arguments on whether the Defendant violated conditions of supervised release, and the appropriate course of action for any such violations.

At the revocation hearing, counsel for the Government and the Defendant announced an agreement as to a recommended disposition regarding the revocation. The Defendant agreed to plead "true" to the allegation that he committed a federal, state, or local crime. In return, the parties agreed that he should serve a term of imprisonment of twelve (12) months and one (1) day. The same term of imprisonment will be imposed in 1:13-CR-98, and the terms shall run concurrently with each other. These terms of imprisonment shall run consecutively to the sentence he is currently serving in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for fraud.

V. Principles of Analysis

CUSTODY

Statutory Provisions:

According to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(3), the Court may revoke a term of supervised release and require the defendant to serve in prison all or part of the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in such term of supervised release without credit for time previously served on post-release supervision, if the Court, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure applicable to revocation of probation or supervised release, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant violated a condition of supervised release, except that a defendant whose term is revoked under this paragraph may not be required to serve on any such revocation more than five years in prison if the offense that resulted in the term of supervised release is a Class A felony, more than three years if such offense is a Class B felony, more than two years in prison if such offense is a Class C or D felony, or more than one year in any other case. The original offense of conviction was a Class B felony; therefore, the maximum imprisonment sentence is 2 years.

Violation Guideline Provisions:

According to U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a), if the Court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that Trahan violated conditions of supervision by being found guilty of fraud, Trahan will be guilty of committing a Grade B violation. U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(a)(1) indicates upon a finding of a Grade A or B violation, the Court shall revoke probation or supervised release.

U.S.S.G. § 7B1.4(a) provides that in the case of revocation of supervised release based on a Grade B violation and a criminal history category of IV, the guideline imprisonment range is 12 to 18 months.

General Guideline Provisions:

According to U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(f) any term of imprisonment imposed upon revocation of probation or supervised release shall be ordered to be served consecutively to any sentence of imprisonment that the defendant is serving, whether or not the sentence of imprisonment being served resulted from the conduct that is the basis of the revocation of probation or supervised release.

SUPERVISED RELEASE
Statutory Provisions:

According to 18 U.S.C. § 3583(h), when a term of supervised release is revoked and the defendant is required to serve a term of imprisonment, the Court may include a requirement that the defendant be placed on a term of supervised release after imprisonment. The length of such a term of supervised release shall not exceed the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in the original term of supervised release, less any term of imprisonment that was imposed upon revocation of supervised release. The authorized term of supervised release for this offense is not more than 5 years.

Guideline Provisions:

U.S.S.G. § 7B1.3(g)(2) indicates where supervised release is revoked and the term of imprisonment imposed is less than the maximum term of imprisonment imposable upon revocation, the Court may include a requirement that the defendant be placed on a term of supervised release upon release from imprisonment. The length of such a term of supervised release shall not exceed

the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in the original term of supervised release, less any term of imprisonment that was imposed upon revocation of supervised release.

In determining the Defendant's sentence, the court shall consider:

1. The nature and circumstance of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; see 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1);
2. The need for the sentence imposed: to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense; to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and to provide the Defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, other corrective treatment in the most effective manner; see 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553 (a)(2)(B)-(D);
3. Applicable guidelines and policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission, for the appropriate application of the provisions when modifying or revoking supervised release pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(3), that are in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; see 18 U.S.C. 3553(a)(4); see also 28 U.S.C. § 924(A)(3);
4. Any pertinent policy statement issued by the Sentencing Commission, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(2), that is in effect on the date the defendant is sentenced; see 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(5); and
5. The need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; see 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(6).
6. The need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

18 U.S.C. §§ 3583(e) and 3553(a).

VI. Application

The Defendant pled "true" to the petition's allegation that he violated a mandatory condition of release that he not commit another federal, state, or local crime. Based upon the Defendant's plea of "true" to this allegation of the Petition for Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision

and U.S.S.G. § 7B1.1(a), the undersigned finds that the Defendant violated a condition of supervised release.

The undersigned has carefully considered each of the factors listed in 18 U.S.C. §§ 3583(e) and 3553(a). The Defendant's violation is a Grade B violation, and his criminal history category is IV. The policy statement range in the Guidelines Manual is 12 to 18 months. The Defendant did not comply with the conditions of his supervision and has demonstrated an unwillingness to adhere to conditions of supervision.

Consequently, incarceration appropriately addresses the Defendant's violation. The sentencing objectives of punishment, deterrence and rehabilitation along with the aforementioned statutory sentencing factors will best be served by a prison sentence of twelve (12) months and one (1) day, with no term of supervised release to follow. This term of imprisonment is to run consecutively to his seven (7) year term of imprisonment in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice for his fraud conviction in Harris County, Texas, and concurrently to his term of imprisonment recommended by this court in 1:13-CR-98.

VII. Recommendations

The court should find that the Defendant violated the allegation in the petition that he violated a mandatory condition of release by committing another federal, state, or local crime. The petition should be granted and the Defendant's supervised release should be revoked pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3583. The Defendant should be sentenced to a term of twelve (12) months and one (1) day imprisonment, with no term of supervised release to follow. This term of imprisonment runs consecutively to his seven (7) year term of imprisonment in the Texas Department of Criminal

Justice for a fraud conviction in Harris County, Texas, and concurrently to his term of imprisonment recommended by this court in 1:13-CR-98.

VIII. Objections

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), each party to this action has the right to file objections to this report and recommendation. Objections to this report must: (1) be in writing, (2) specifically identify those findings or recommendations to which the party objects, and (3) be served and filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of this report, and (4) no more than eight (8) pages in length. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) (2009); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2); Local Rule CV-72(c). A party who objects to this report is entitled to a *de novo* determination by the United States District Judge of those proposed findings and recommendations to which a specific objection is timely made. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2009); FED R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3).

A party's failure to file specific, written objections to the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in this report, within fourteen (14) days of being served with a copy of this report, bars that party from: (1) entitlement to *de novo* review by the United States District Judge of the findings of fact and conclusions of law, see Rodriguez v. Bowen, 857 F.2d 275, 276–77 (5th Cir. 1988), and (2) appellate review, except on grounds of plain error, of any such findings of fact and conclusions of law accepted by the United States District Judge, see Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

SIGNED this 6th day of June, 2016.



Zack Hawthorn
United States Magistrate Judge